

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

RONALD E. FREETO,

Plaintiff,

v.

LITTON LOAN SERVICING LP; et al.,

Defendants.

3:09-cv-00754-LRH-VPC

ORDER

Before the court is defendants' motion to strike plaintiff Ronald E. Freeto's ("Freeto") reply to his renewed motion to remand. Doc. #67.¹

I. Facts and Procedural History

In April 2005, Freeto purchased real property through a mortgage and note originated by defendant Lime Financial Services. He eventually defaulted on his mortgage and defendants initiated foreclosure proceedings.

Subsequently, on November 17, 2009, Freeto filed a complaint in state court against defendants. Doc. #1, Exhibit 1. Defendants removed the matter to federal court on federal question grounds. Doc. #1. Freeto filed an initial motion to remand (Doc. #12) which the court denied (Doc. #30).

¹ Refers to the court's docket entry number.

1 Subsequently, Freeto filed a renewed motion to remand. Doc. #55. Defendants filed an
2 opposition (Doc. #62) to which Freeto replied (Doc. #66). Thereafter, defendants filed the present
3 motion to strike arguing that Freeto's reply was untimely. Doc. #67.

4 The court has already denied Freeto's renewed motion for remand. *See* Doc. #68.
5 Therefore, the court finds it unnecessary to strike Freeto's reply as untimely because the
6 underlying motion has been resolved. Accordingly, the court shall deny defendants' motion to
7 strike as moot.

8 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendants' motion to strike (Doc. #67) is DENIED as
9 moot.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED this 15th day of December, 2010.



12
13
14
15 LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26